DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 214 HE 013 322

AUTHOR Hansen, Evelyn Unes
TITLE The Commanding English Program: Its Development, Use, Misuse, and Abuse: A Communication Analysis. Pilot Education Programs, Final Report, 1979-1980. Appendix B.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. General Coll.
PUB DATE Jul 80
NOTE 54p.: For related documents, see HE 013 320-321. Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of original document.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement: Academic Persistence: Basic Skills: College Attendance: College Students: *Communicative Competence (Languages): Cultural Context: Educational Counseling: Educationally Disadvantaged: Educational Objectives: *English (Second Language): Ethnic Groups: Higher Education: *High Risk Students: *Latin Americans: Learning Modules: *Mexican Americans: Minority Groups: Pilot Projects: Program Costs: Program Evaluation: School Holding Power: Student Attrition: Student Characteristics: Teaching Methods: Tutorial Programs
IDENTIFIERS *University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT

As part of the General College of the University of Minnesota's Pilot Education Program (PEP) (1979-80) for academically underprepared minority group students, background information is presented about the development of the Chicano/Latino PEP package, the way that the Chicano/Latino team functioned: the nature, content, and teaching methods: and outcomes of the program. The oral communication component comprised a course in interpersonal communication and one in leadership and group process for non-native English speakers. This component was supplemented by support from tutors in skills centers and counseling. In addition to a description of the development of the Chicano/Latino package, the following materials are included: objectives of the "Commanding English" course, a list of required courses for the PEP package, course descriptions, and a summary of PEP costs and funding. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED195214

PEP pilot education programs

FINAL REPORT 1979-1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

General College
University of Minnesota

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 013 322

general college

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Dean

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

General College
106 Nicholson Hall
216 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

November 19, 1980

Frank Wilderson
Vice President, Student Affairs
110 Morrill Hall

Dear Frank:

In the fall of 1979, the General College received through the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs (OMSSA) a part of a University Legislative Special designated for retention. With this allocation, the General College mounted an academic retention program for various groups of minority students. According to the terms of our original proposal to OMSSA, the General College understood that it was obligated to prepare an accounting of the use of the funds allocated to us and an evaluation of our retention program. The attached report is submitted to you as a fulfillment of that commitment.

The report and the documents accompanying it are, I believe, clear and convincing testimony to the faithful expenditure of the funds provided to us for retention efforts and to the success of the program that the funds helped to create.

The attached report speaks for itself. However, if you or any of your colleagues would like clarification or elaboration of any point in it, both Professor Zanoni, the primary author, and I are available to discuss its contents with you at your convenience.

I would appreciate any reaction that you might have to the attached report.

Cordially,

Jeanne T. Lupton
Dean

JTL/rmr
CC: C. Peter Magrath
Nils Hasselmo
Stanley B. Kegler
Kenneth Keller
Clinton T. Johnson
Candido Zanoni

APPENDIX B

THE COMMANDING ENGLISH PROGRAM: ITS DEVELOPMENT, USE, MISUSE, AND ABUSE

A COMMUNICATION ANALYSIS

Evelyn Unes Hansen

July 1980

Introduction

For the past two years, I have been involved with a group of colleagues from the ACP Division in a project which we titled the Commanding English Program. Our team spent one year (1977-1978) designing the program and seeking funds for its support, and a subsequent year (1979-1980) teaching and refining the courses we had planned, and working toward their integration. What follows in these pages is a report of the oral communication component of the program for which I had responsibility. That component comprised a course in interpersonal communication and one in leadership and group process, each specially adapted to the experiences and needs of the specific population which Commanding English was originally intended to serve, i.e., non-native speakers of English.

On invitation, I joined the generative group when it was formed in 1977 strictly because of my interest in, and past experience with, the teaching of non-native speakers of English. I will remain in the Program as long as it continues to serve that special population and can use my skills and resources.

I regret to say that where curricular and administrative decisions were taken which involved the Commanding English Program for other than the non-native students for whom it was originally designed, they have lead to a complex series of events which have served to distract and drain us all.

Background

For the record, I want to document the history of this program, and its original intent. It had its genesis when, late in 1977, we began to be aware of increasing numbers of "foreign" students among our General College population. At one of those between-sessions registration periods -- I believe it was just before the opening of fall session -- when hordes are gathered in the hall waiting to register and we're down to about ten open courses, we had a large influx of such students, many of whom could barely understand us, and most of whom were bent on registering for only those technical or math coorses in the Institute of Technology, or the specialized courses in the College of Home Economics that they had come to the United States to get. It was frustrating for the students as well as for those of us who were working that afternoon, and it was also eye-opening.

Professor Zanoni and I were on assigned advising duty that day, and we discussed the increasingly apparent need for helping such students to improve their English skills, and agreed that unless they did, other colleges would probably be outside their reach. During the year, informally and in our advising, we noted the academic progress of many of those "foreign" students and discovered in the records of many of them, a quite clear pattern of N's, W's, and I's. At that time, most of the students were from Arabic-speaking countries and from Central and South America.

Still concerned about the problem, a year later, in fall 1978, Professor Zanoni invited a group from ACP to study the matter and to

propose a program for assisting the growing numbers of non-native speakers of English who were enrolled in General College. That first group included Michael Arrington, Sandra Dylla, Jill Gidmark, Darryl Hattenhauer, William Stockdale, and me. Professor Zanoni appointed Sandra Dylla chairperson of the committee.

The group met weekly throughout the academic year 1978-1979, analyzing the problem and studying ways of approaching it. By then, the population of students from other countries had grown noticeably, and had extended to large numbers of Southeast Asians, Iranians, Nigerians, and some Ethiopians and Europeans. In committee, we stopped referring to them as "foreign" and began talking about "non-native" and "international" speakers of English, in recognition of the fact that many were exiles or emigrees who might never be able to return to their own native countries. We devised a program of intensive study to be offered as a package, and we applied for an EDP grant to help fund the project.

We proposed a two-quarter pilot sequence made up of courses already in the curriculum, but with special adaptations, as needed, to serve the needs of our target group. The two-quarter sequence of study included specially designed versions of the following courses:

Fall 1979:
- GC 1401 Vocabulary Development - 3 cr
- GC 1402 Reading, Comprehension, and Study Skills - 3 cr
- GC 1403 Punctuation and Spelling - 2 cr
- GC 1404 Grammar and Writing - 2 cr
- GC 1465 Interpersonal Communication - 3 cr

Total - 13 cr

Winter 1980: GC 1406 Reading Module - 2 cr
GC 1421 Personal Writing - 4 cr - or
GC 1405 Fundamentals of Usage and Style - 3 cr
GC 1464 Leadership and Group Process - 4 cr
plus one 5-credit course in science, social science, or behavioral science

We were aiming for those students who had had training in the English As a Second Language (ESL) Program, but who were still not ready for "mainstream" registration. At that time, the ESL Program was under the directorship of Professor Betty Robbinett of the College of Liberal Arts. We met with staff members of her department and with Professor Robbinett and reached an understanding whereby we agreed not to admit students to our program if they had not attained certain designated scores on the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency. We agreed to require incoming students to have achieved a score of 65, and students who had already been registered at the University and had had previous work in ESL to have attained a score of 60 on that test.

With our population defined, our program of courses decided upon, our criteria for admission agreed upon, and our EDP grant awarded, we began to search for and to develop materials that would be appropriate for our non-native speakers. Our planning year was drawing to a close. By then, only about a month and a half of spring quarter remained. The experiment we were planning for the coming year was to be carried out as a part of our regular teaching load, and funded by the Division with a very minimal EDP supplementation.

Commanding English Program Annexed

1979 was a legislative year. Late in April 1979, when legislative appropriations to the University were becoming known, our committee learned that Dean Lupton had asked Professor Zanoni to prepare for her a statement of costs for the possible offering of a separate and sheltered section of the Commanding English Program for Chicano-Latino students. We learned that the Program we had been planning was being proposed as part of a project which the College was initiating for improved retention of students. Pilot Educational Packages (PEP) for three separate groups - Black students, Native Americans, and Chicano-Latino students - were constituted. The PEP package for Chicano-Latino students included our Commanding English Program. Dean Lupton used the PEP packages to bid for a share of the legislative appropriation to Central Administration and the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs for support of such endeavors.

When spring quarter ended, our committee faced the prospect of having to offer two sections of the intensive program in the coming year - one section for International Students for which we had planned, and one section - as yet unfunded - for Chicano-Latino students for which we had done no planning. Negotiations for the funds continued throughout the summer, and were finally concluded in early fall 1979. Our committee members were placed on appointment from September 1 to 15 to prepare for teaching Commanding English in the PEP section for Chicano-Latino students. We had little, if any, information about the group, so we proceeded on assumptions about their educational backgrounds and needs.

Commanding English Annexation: Perceptions and Apprehensions Created

As the summer wore on, and negotiations for funds continued, our team became increasingly aware that ours was not the only group which was operating in a vacuum of information. We sensed a strong undercurrent of feeling concerning the inclusion of our Commanding English Program in the PEP section being proposed for Chicano-Latino students. These attitudes emanated from a Counseling-Support group associated with the College whose responsibilities center on Chicano-Latino students. Through a series of transactions and committee sessions, our team gathered the impression that the Counseling-Support group may have had as little a part as our own team had had in the April decision to include Commanding English as a required part of the PEP offerings for Chicano-Latino students. But worse yet, we realized that that group seemed to be operating on the conviction that our team had autocratically set up the requirement.

In fact, neither of the two groups had participated in the making of that decision. Each felt, at the least, manipulated, and at the most, disenfranchised. As a result, the seeds of misperception had taken root and borne fruit, and before we had even begun offering the Program, we were bringing in a rich harvest of apprehension and frustration.

Feeling that our carefully designed Program had been appropriated without so much as a "by your leave," our team felt that we were being burdened beyond our capacity, while, on the other hand, the Counseling-Support group seemed to feel that we had invaded their territory, raided their students, and were bent on using them for our own ends and power.

The Commanding English Program: Predetermined Principles, Procedures, and Policies

During our planning year, we had articulated a set of principles, procedures, and policies, the adoption and enforcement of which we believed essential to the success of a venture such as the one on which we were embarking. Our intention was to provide students an intensive experience in English, to immerse them in a language bath, and insofar as possible, to coordinate and integrate the content and activities of the Program. We aimed at creating a familiar, comfortable, predictable, and safe environment for learning, one in which students could learn to trust us, themselves, and each other, and where they could feel free to abandon their inhibitions about using a new language. All of us believed in the goals we shared in common, and in the necessity for coordinating our efforts carefully if we were to guide and reinforce students on their way to the attainment of those goals.

We agreed that the entire staff should meet together at least once a week to talk about what we were doing in classes and about any problems we might be encountering. In addition, we agreed that having the teaching team meet with the assembled class for at least one hour each week would be valuable and productive.

Finally, we adopted these policies for conducting the program: Inasmuch as we had designed the Program to be an integral unit, we stated that students should not be allowed to register for only selected parts, but should be required to enroll in the Program in its entirety. Because

of our conviction that mastering a language requires daily practice and reinforcement of learning, we stated that prompt and regular class attendance would be expected. We set a maximum number of allowable absences for each class, and agreed that students who exceeded that number would be dropped from the course, and also from the Program, the unity and completeness of which would otherwise be lost. In setting these policies, we were determined to preserve the philosophy on which our design was based -- the program concept in which selected experiences are coordinated as a means of attaining a particular goal -- as opposed to creating the impression that these were a set of isolated courses listed together from which students may pick and choose.

Commanding English: Objectives

In addition to the principles, procedures, and policies we had set for the Program, we had spent weeks defining our general objectives and objectives for each of the component courses. For the population we expected to be working with, we considered the objectives appropriate and realistic. I have appended a complete set to this report.

I cannot speak for my colleagues on the team, but I can speak for myself and say that when September arrived, and we were told that the PEP section for Chicano-Latino students had been funded and that we would be teaching it, I began to be concerned. When we were put on appointment from September 1 - 15, I knew I should be revising my objectives, and yet, I didn't have any information on which to base a revision. Who would these students be? What needs would they have? How should our Program

be adapted so as to be of greatest value to them? What language facility would they have in English? How knowledgeable would they be about communication patterns in the American culture? These and other questions played through my mind constantly. Feeling anxious, I would study my list of objectives once again, always with the sinking feeling that they somehow were not well focused for this unexpected assignment.

To allay some of the anxiety, and to make some preparations for the new group, I decided to use the two-week appointment to prepare a study guide for the textbook, reasoning that, no matter what the language proficiency of the group proved to be, the study guide would be useful. I prepared study questions over twelve chapters from the textbook, Monologue to Dialogue by Brown and Keller. I can say now, in retrospect, that the study guide provided an invaluable service to the students and to me. But all the time I was working on it, I was tormented by anxious feelings and doubts as to its potential worth. After a test run during fall quarter, 1979, I refined the questions and had the book typed professionally by Terri Lawson in the ACP Division office, then reproduced by offset process, and delivered to Williamson Bookstore where students now purchase it for use in the class.

The Chicano-Latino Students: My Assumptions vs. Reality

In the absence of information, I tried to anticipate who and how old these students would be, what educational backgrounds they would probably present, and what language needs they would bring. Here are

some of my assumptions. I assumed, first of all, that these students would be older than average, that they would be migrant workers or the sons and daughters of migrant workers, and that Spanish would be their primary language. I assumed, further, that as a result of the migrant's life, their educational backgrounds would be sparse -- perhaps severely impoverished. I expected most of them to have come from out of state, and I imagined that many would have been without any permanent place of residence. I believed that most would be proficient in Spanish, and less comfortable and confident about their use of English. Mentally, I prepared myself to teach such a group of students.

My assumptions couldn't have been more inaccurate. When the quarter began, this is what I discovered:

Age -	Number	Permanent Residence	Number
17	1	Minneapolis-St.Paul	19
18	8	Mexico	1
19	7	Peru, South America	1
20	4	Colombia, " "	1
22	1	Texas	6
23	1	Unknown	1
25	2		
26	1		
?	4		

Most, it turned out, were high school graduates, many from Twin Cities high schools or schools in Texas, Mexico, or Peru. Only a few were from migrant families. Many were fluent in Spanish, but it was not by any means the primary language of most of the group. A few could neither speak nor understand Spanish. Three of them were outstanding students; two had been star athletes in high school.

In many ways, they were probably not much different from other entering freshmen. Their most obvious need seemed first, to become

acclimated to the University, and then, to learn the discipline of college study. While many seemed old for their years, several were extremely immature and carried with them through much of the first quarter behaviors more appropriate to high school than to college students. Three of the students were dilatory about class attendance and assignments, and despite repeated reminders about policies concerning attendance, and warnings that they would be dropped from the Program for excessive absences, they persisted in cutting classes and failing to turn in assigned work or to attend on days quizzes were scheduled. When, finally, we enforced the rules we had set, and dropped the dilatory students from the Program, we ran headlong into a communication barrier with the Counseling-Support group that had been erected from misperceptions months before. From that moment on, the battle lines were drawn; subsequent events, however minor, fueled the controversy and escalated feelings of both groups. What began as misperceptions grew into convictions tinged with bitterness.

Course Activities

Students became active in my courses immediately, both in fall and winter. In fall quarter, I wrote them a letter and gave it to them on the first day. I asked them to write me a letter of reply and turn it in on the following class day. They were assigned to read a chapter each week from their text, and to complete answers to the study guide questions on that chapter. Each week, I collected the study guide answers -- for most chapters, there are 20-30 questions -- read them, wrote comments on them, and returned them with a grade. Every other week, I assigned a subject dealing with some aspect of interpersonal communication, and required each student to prepare an oral presentation

which I recorded on videotape. Following each taping session, we viewed the presentations and noted students' growth in language usage, and the changes in self-assurance and self-esteem. Most students made five videotapes throughout the quarter, and those have been saved for review and possible research. Unfortunately, during the final taping session, the machine failed, and as a result, the last presentation of fall quarter which I had hoped to use as visual evidence of students' progress was lost forever. The students and I were disappointed and angry because we had been working toward that pinnacle all quarter, and we felt really let down.

In addition to the written and oral activities, I gave three subjective tests and a final written project of self-evaluation during fall quarter.

The winter quarter class dealt with leadership and group process. Again, I involved students in the class immediately, this time by having them address the class in the first session. Each student took part in four group projects throughout the quarter for which s/he was required to take responsibility with the others for everything from beginning to end -- from search for a topic to the final polished presentation. I tried to involve each student in a leadership role at some time during the quarter. Students were required to develop group outlines and individual outlines for each of the four projects, and to submit those outlines for review and grade.

In addition to the written and oral activities, I gave three subjective tests and a final written project of self-evaluation during winter quarter.

Records of Growth

Grade reports stand as evidence of students' progress in a course, and those are available for research purposes. But grade reports, alone, can't tell the human side of the story. The visual experience of seeing students' written and oral work week after week gives a much more complete sense of how and what growth occurs.

I have already reported that the videotapes which students made in the interpersonal communication course have been preserved. In addition to the videotapes, I had Xerox copies made of all the tests they wrote throughout the two quarters, their letters to me, and their final self-evaluations. All of those are kept in the individual file we established for each student, together with standardized test scores and other relevant data.

Student Response to the Oral Communication Courses in the Program

At the end of the winter quarter, I asked students in both sections of my course -- 1464 for Commanding English -- to fill out course evaluations for the all-University Student Course Information Project (SCIP). Those two sections involved the Chicano-Latino PEP group, and also the international group of Commanding English. I have appended a copy of the final compilation of their responses. The two sections have been combined in this final report, but I have included with this report, nonetheless, because I believe it represents both sections fairly. Besides the booklet which will be issued to students, I have also attached a Xerox copy of the page contained in the advisors' unabridged version of the SCIP report which gives more complete information.

Students' Narrative Responses to the Course and the Program

Teachers are like parents. When they are fond of students and proud of the part they've played in bringing about growth, teachers enjoy telling others what their students had to say about the course and its value to them. I've restrained myself from doing what I would like to have done for this report: reproduce every initial letter to me, followed by each student's final self-evaluation for each quarter of the program, so that readers could share in the students' excitement and enthusiasm about their results. Instead, I have selected this self-evaluation, written at the end of the first quarter by a student from South America who knew almost no English when the quarter began:

> When I entered the University in September I was afraid of many things: my disadvantage in language, not to be a good student, of the teachers, almost everything. Also I didn't know or I wasn't sure which courses to take or where to go for help.
>
> I think during this quarter I have learned a lot of things which will be useful for me to being a good student. I think the reading skill center is a valuable help to the student. I myself took a lot of advantage of this center, at first because they have tutors in there and second, because you learn a lot in the courses 1401-1402.
>
> Also I'm not afraid of the teachers any more. Because all of them are always open to help the students. For me it is important to have good communication with the instructors.
>
> In resume I'm grateful to all the instructors because I think they made a lot of work to make us feel not to be afraid of the University or the instructors. And I also think that I have learned very much. I have developed my skills in English and communication.
>
> Now at the end of the quarter I feel different than at the beginning. I feel more secure of myself and what are my goals in here. Also I know now that I can be and everybody can be a good student if we want and work for it. My opinion is here in the "U" the students can get all the help they need, but the students have to be interested in being good students and also have the strong mind of make sure that they are really doing their best in here.
>
> November 30, 1979

In spring quarter, 1980, we offered a new sequence of Commanding English which enrolled a group of international students and a group of Chicano-Latino students who were referred to as the "monolingual" group because when they entered the University in fall, 1979, they could speak no English. I haven't said anything about that offering of the Program in this report because I had too much else to cover. But the experience was a very good one, and I shall make it the subject of another paper some time. I would like to include the end-of-quarter evaluations written by two of the Chicano students as witness to the value they placed upon their experience in our Program.

> Student A: First of all I would like to tell you that the principal reason I enrolled in the Commanding English Program was the encouragement given by my previous instructor (Sally Lund-Chirinnos) whose excellent teaching style contributed a lot to my preparation to qualify for this program. The Commanding English Program was very practical and useful for me and I am going to try to explain a little bit in what manner it help me to improve my knowledge . . .
>
> Although 1465 was the most difficult class, it was also the most important because communication is the genesis, the origin, the root of any culture. It is the basis to begin any relationship between two persons or between the people.
>
> I am completely sure that my confidence increased during this period because the peculiar style which the instructor taught this course made me feel more comfortable and I acquired a lot of experiences that before I never analyzed.
>
> I compared and valued all my earlier experiences with my actual situation and I inferred that I can do better anything if I want to do it.
>
> To summarize I believe this has been a magnificent intensive training English course which provided me with an excellent information regarding to very and different aspects of this extraordinary new culture for me.
>
> I only suggest that this kind of program will continue in the future for new students who need special classes to improve their knowledge . . .

May, 1980

Student B: I did enroll in the Commanding English because I need to learn a lot of things about vocabulary, reading, spelling, paragraphing and interpersonal Communication . . .

Interpersonal Communication was a course too beautiful to me because I never had deliberated how people can be friendly with each other through the communication. I learned how people can understand me through the sounds, signs, gestures, manners. I had heard about these things but I never had been trying to practice them. I think the teacher was the most important person to me because when she was talking about some experience, I felt like she was remembering some part of my life before I came to this class . . .

The use of videotape had too much value to me because I never had been in TV and the first time I was too nervous. But I felt too good because I thought that I was a TV star and I was talking in front of thousands of people because I saw the rest of my classmates like a big crowd. . .

I think without the tutors in skill center I had not been able to do a lot of things because when I had a problem in some of my assignments I went to some of them and they helped me to resolve it.

I give thanks to all of them . . .

May, 1980

Supporting Services

This is an effective program, a program that works successfully, as a review of retention rates and students' grades reveal. Much of its success is due to the careful planning and strong relationships developed by our team, and to the almost daily interchange of information about classroom events and potential student problems. Much is due to the excellent backup help we receive from the tutors in the Skills Centers. In my opinion, the master key to the program's effectiveness is in the centrality of Sandra Dylla as chairperson. In her role as Director of the Skills Center, she is able to bring into the team a group of teaching associates and tutors, to train them for working with

the students, and to monitor their work. Daily, as we spot students' needs or problems, we report them to Sandra. In turn, she moves quickly -- sees the student, assigns a tutor to work with him/her on the problem, and arranges for whatever followup help may be needed. Without that centrality and that potential for almost immediate action, I believe the program would never have the success this one has.

Personal Note

Teaching in an intensive program like this is a draining experience. At the same time, it is such a rewarding experience for me to work with the kinds of students I have been describing in this paper that I dread the day when that must end. Teaching two sections of this program last fall, in addition to a 3-level course in Organizational Communication which completed my academic load, was almost more than I could manage. By the fourth week of the quarter, I knew that unless I was provided teaching assistant help, I was headed for a physical collapse.

I want to express appreciation to Professor Zanoni and to Dean Lupton for recognizing the validity of my appeal, and for providing me with a reader to assist with papers and tests. I know that I could not have sustained the load without that help. I know, too, that I would have had to withdraw from the Program had some relief not been provided. I appreciate the reduction in load that I was given during winter quarter; I needed that time to prepare the second quarter of our sequence and to stay one-half step ahead of my two classes. I am committed to the concept of requiring students to write and speak almost daily in a program such as this. But that requirement is worthless

to students without a teacher's reading and commenting upon what has been written or spoken. The value of it derives from the dialogue. It's that dialogue that I want to continue, but in order to do so, I need the kind of support you provided me last year.

Finally, I want to say that I'm excited about being a part of this endeavor and proud that this College encourages us in this effort. I have trumpeted this Program at SCEP and at the Immigration History Research Center, and have found genuine interest in what we are doing.

Evelyn Unes Hansen

August, 1980

Some Statistics

Here are some figures showing enrollments in my fall, winter, and spring PEP sections of Commanding English, and the distribution of final grades in those courses.

	Fall, 1979 GC 1465	Winter, 1980 GC 1464	Spring, 1980 GC 1467
Initial Enrollment	26	21	14
Final Grades:			
A 11	2	2	2
A 10	4	2	3
B 9	1	4	2
B 8	5	2	2
C 7	3	4	0
C 6	5	1	0
C 5	2	1	1
D 4	0	0	0
D 3	1	0	0
N	0	1	2
W	3	4	2
I	0	0	0

COMMANDING ENGLISH: OBJECTIVES

OVERALL GOAL: By the end of the program, students will have greater proficiency in English in the following four areas.

1. Vocabulary (word-level proficiency)
   A. Production: Students will learn to write (and spell correctly) and speak a sizeable number of new words, using them with a appropriate denotation and connotation and syntactic accuracy.
   B. Comprehension: Students will learn to read and hear a sizeable number of new words, and, in doing so, understand the denotation and connotation of these words in the discourses they appear in.

2. Idioms (phrase-level proficiency)
   A. Production: Students will learn to speak and write idioms correctly.
   B. Comprehension: Students will be able to understand these idioms when they read them or hear them spoken.

3. Syntax (sentence-level proficiency)
   A. Production: Students will be able to speak and write sentences in which they make correct use of a wide range of sentence patterns.
   B. Comprehension: Students will be able to understand the syntactic structures used in the speech they hear and in the material they read.

4. Discourse (conversation-to paragraph-level)
   A. Production: Students will be able to give short speeches or write short paragraphs that show command of the previous three areas plus ability to construct well-formed discourse.
   B. Comprehension: Students will be able to understand well-formed written or spoken discourse.

Course Objectives for GC 1401 for Non-native English Speakers

A. Students will master* several vocabularies
   1. Pre-set vocabularies (200 items)
      A. Technical vocabulary: the vocabulary of word study; examples: noun, verb, transitive, stymology, derivation, cognate, etc. (to be more fully specified by Jill) (about 50 items).
      B. Most common word-parts: limit here of something like 50 wordparts.
      C. Foreign elements in English: loan-words from Chinese, Arabic, Spanish, American Indian, French, etc. (about 100 items).
   2. Pragmatic/Idiomatic: finding their own words from all kinds of sources, encourage 2/day? (= about 140 items).

*master means: A) will be able to recognize and understand** these words on a reading test; B) will be able to write paraphrases of sentences (one-to-one) containing these words; C) will be able to pronounce the words correctly; D) will be able to hear and understand** a story containing these words.

**understand means: use in speech or writing in a way that a well-educated native speaker does not find odd; respond to the word in a way that a well-educated native speaker would not find odd.

B. Students will demonstrate mastery of dictionary search techniques by taking a dictionary-search test and earning a score of at least 70%.

C. Students will demonstrate mastery of an independent-study vocabulary-development technique by showing the teacher the written product of the technique, and by performing A.2, above.

Course Objectives for GC 1402 for Non-native English Speakers

A. Given a series of short articles, students will demonstrate their ability to use a variety of reading techniques on them. For example, if given an article and instructions to survey it, students should be able to pass a short test (score 70% correct or better) on content of first paragraph, headings, and last paragraph. If given an article and instructions to skim it, then, after one minute or less, they should be able either to write a precis or take a test to measure how much of the gist of the article they took in, and so on.

B. Students will be able to identify in pieces of writing:
   1. main ideas
   2. supporting ideas
   3. organizational pattern
      a. temporal
      b. spatial
      c. logical
      d. topical

      } relationships among parts of a discourse; structural patterns
   4. components of discourse
      a. conversational
      b. expository
      c. narrative
      d. descriptive

C. Students will improve reading speed. Average improvement will be 50% of initial reading speed, except that a final reading speed of 350 wpm, regardless of improvement rate, counts as B-level work, provided recall stays around 70% (effective reading rate = 245 wpm).

D. Students will report that the amount of time they devote to outside reading unrelated to coursework has increased, that they get more reading done in the amount of time they devote to reading, and that they get more pleasure, feel more successful when they read.

E. Students will be able to read and comprehend at a minimum of three levels (ranging from casual to formal).

Course Objectives for GC 1465 for Non-Native English Speakers

A. Students will be able to use their daily vocabulary (pragmatic/idiomatic) findings appropriately in spoken discourse.

B. They will be able to respond to questions from the instructor and fellow students about their pragmatic/idiomatic vocabulary.

C. They will each be able to speak for at least two minutes per class meeting bout their activities in 1401/2/3/4.

D. They will each share one idea (concept) per class meeting learned in the course of their reading for 1402.

E. They will be better able to handle themselves in a variety of situations which model some environments: restaurant settings, telephone use, approaching officials (assertiveness/tact training) making complaints, understanding media (TV, movies, a radio).

F. They will, at the end of the course be able to converse at a minimum of two levels (ranging from casual to formal) and understand other speakers at a minimu of three levels.

Course Objectives for GC 1404: Grammar Through Writing and GC 1403: Improving Spelling, Punctuation for Non-Native English Speakers

A. Students will be able to use their developing vocabulary in clear, idiomatic, simple and compound sentences which are punctuated according to SAE.

B. Students will be able to coordinate words, phrases, and clauses and to punctuate coordination according to SAE.

C. Students will be able to invert word order of simple sentences - as questions, t mark emphasis, to add variety.

D. Students will be able to identify and write sentences in active and passive voice.

E. Students will be able to identify and write sentences in the three most basic English patterns (Subject-Verb, Subject-Verb-Object, Subject-Linking Verb-Subject Complement).

F. Students will be able to write sentences of varying lengths, including sentences of 15 or more words, that follow all above criteria.

G. Students will be able to sustain a subject through several sentences.

H. Students will be able to combine sentences on a sustained topic into a co-ordinate structure paragraph.

I. Students will be able to write a paragraph at a minimum of two levels (from casual to formal).

J. Students will master spellings in vocabulary course both pre-set and pragmatic.

K. Students will master basic rules of spelling that those words illustrate.

L. Students will be able to extend application of those rules to new words.

APPENDIX C

PEP PACKAGES

Required Courses

1979-1980

PEP I (American Indian) SCHEDULE: 1979-80

Required Courses

Fall, 1979		
1405	(3 cr)	Communication Skills: Fundamentals of Usage and Style
or		
1421	(4 cr)	Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing
1708	(2 cr)	Support Seminar (see course description attached)
1831	(4 cr)	Special Topics: Chemical Dependency (see course description attached)
Winter, 1980		
1405	(3 cr)	Communication Skills (continued)
or		
1421	(4 cr)	Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing (continued)
or		
1422	(4 cr)	Writing Laboratory: Communicating in Society
1708	(2 cr)	Support Seminar
1832	(4 cr)	Special Topics: Extended Family
Spring, 1980		
1421	(4 cr)	Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing (continued)
or		
1422	(4 cr)	Writing Laboratory: Communicating in Society (continued)
1431-1433	(3 cr)	Fundamental College Mathematics (elective) (Special sections reserved for PEP students)
1708	(2 cr)	Support Seminar
1833	(4 cr)	Special Topics: Bi-cultural Existence

PEP II (Chicano/Latino: Monolingual) SCHEDULE: 1979-80

Required Courses

Fall, 1979		
1278	(3 cr)	Special Topics: Migrants in Minnesota (see course description attached)
1409	(4 cr)	Individual Study: Communication Skills
1429	(3 cr)	Individual Study: Writing
1708	(2 cr)	Support Seminar
Winter, 1980		
1278	(3 cr)	Special Topics: Chicano History
1409	(4 cr)	Individual Study: Communication Skills (continued)
1429	(3 cr)	Individual Study: Writing (continued)
1708	(2 cr)	Support Seminar
Spring, 1980		
1401	(3 cr)	Communication Skills: Vocabulary Development
1402	(3 cr)	Communication Skills: Reading, Comprehension, and Study Skills
1403	(2 cr)	Improving Spelling and Punctuation
1404	(2 cr)	Writing Grammatical Sentences and Developing Organized Paragraphs
1465	(3 cr)	Oral Communication: Interpersonal Communication
1708	(2 cr)	Support Seminar

PEP II (Chicano/Latino: Bilingual) SCHEDULE: 1979-80

Required Courses

Fall, 1979

1278	(3 cr)	Special Topics: Migrants in Minnesota (see course description attached)
1401	(3 cr)	Communication Skills: Vocabulary Development
1402	(3 cr)	Communication Skills: Reading, Comprehension, and Study Skills
1403	(2 cr)	Improving Spelling and Punctuation
1404	(2 cr)	Writing Grammatical Sentences and Developing Organized Paragraphs
1465	(3 cr)	Oral Communication: Interpersonal Communication
1708	(2 cr)	Support Seminar

Winter, 1980

1278	(3 cr)	Special Topics: Chicano History
1405	(3 cr)	Communication Skills: Fundamentals of Usage and Style
or		
1421	(4 cr)	Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing
1406	(3 cr)	Improving Study Skills, Reading Comprehension, and Vocabulary
1464	(4 cr)	Oral Communication: Group Process and Discussion
1708	(2 cr)	Support Seminar

Spring, 1980

1278	(3 cr)	Special Topics: Chicano Literature (see course description attached)
1421	(4 cr)	Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing
or		
1422	(4 cr)	Writing Laboratory: Communicating in Society
1431-1433	(3 cr)	Fundamental College Mathematics (elective) (Special sections reserved for PEP students)
1708	(2 cr)	Support Seminar

PEP III (Black) SCHEDULE: 1979-80

Required Courses

Fall, 1979

1405	(3 cr)	Communication Skills: Fundamentals of Usage and Style
1461	(5 cr)	Oral Communication: Basic Principles
1708	(2 cr)	Support Seminar
1815	(5 cr)	Afro-American Studies

Winter, 1980

1212	(5 cr)	Urban Problems
1421	(4 cr)	Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing
1431-1433	(3 cr)	Fundamental College Mathematic (elective) (Special sections reserved for PEP students)
1708	(2 cr)	Support Seminar

Spring, 1980

1422	(4 cr)	Writing Laboratory: Communicating in Society
1431-1433	(3 cr)	Fundamental College Mathematics (elective) (Special sections reserved for PEP students)
1708	(2 cr)	Support Seminar
1816	(2 cr)	Afro-American Literature

COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

Special PEP Courses

GC 1278 Special Topics: Migrants in Minnesota (Fall, 1979)

The course will provide an analysis of main issues involved in migratory farm-labor conditions. As a social issue, the areas of study to be covered are education, legislation, and labor/employment. The need to relate academic knowledge to experiential knowledge is a prime concern. For this reason, guest lecturers and panels will be used in the class as primary resource persons. Films and news coverage will be discussed.

GC 1278 Special Topics: Chicano Literature (Spring, 1980)

This course will examine the development of the Mexican community in the U.S. in the 20th century. It will focus on the changes that took place in that community as a consequence of increased immigration from Mexico and on labor demands which resulted from agricultural and industrial developments in the U.S., as well as labor shortages caused by the two world wars. Major emphasis given to the tensions between those parts of the community that maintained their Mexican culture and those which stressed the Americanization of the Mexican population, and how these tensions led to the development of a Chicano consciousness. The course will utilize literature to show how these changes manifested themselves.

GC 1708 Support Seminar (each quarter)

This course is designed to develop the basic academic skills of entering freshmen and provide the information essential to their success as students on this campus. Through a combination of lectures, discussions, and classroom assignments, students will increase their retention of information from lectures and texts, improve their performance on exams and written assignments, learn to cope with standard University procedures, and obtain information about the campus and community resources available to support their efforts.

GC 1831 Special Topics: Chemical Dependency (Fall, 1979)

This course will not be a conventional course dealing with drug abuse. What we hope to do is to look at the conventional literature on causes, effects, and treatment of chemical abuse to see whether there are cultural values implicitly and explicitly assumed in this literature which may limit its applicability to specific population groups within American society, specifically American Indian individuals and families.

In order to consider this hypothesis, we will look at a number of Indian and non-Indian chemical dependency prevention and treatment programs in the Minneapolis/St. Paul area. We will also look at basic cultural differences between Indians and non-Indians to ascertain to what extent these basic differences must be taken into consideration in the cause/treatment/effect questions revolving around chemical dependency.

APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF PEP COSTS

1979-1980

Prepared

by

Candido P. Zanoni

SUMMARY OF PEP COSTS

1979-1980

	Fall '79	Winter '80	Spring '80	Total
PEP I	$ 5,295	$ 5,542	$ 5,320	$ 16,157
PEP II (M)	2,103	2,820	8,205	13,128
PEP II (B)	8,807	7,862	5,712	22,381
PEP III	1,478	1,450	1,438	4,366
Evaluation	1,487	2,606	1,996	6,089
HELP Center	371	338	590	1,299
CSD (Carrillo)	2,124	2,124	2,124	6,372
SBM (Math)	—	1,593	—	1,593
Start-up Costs	10,198	—	—	10,198
Final Evaluation	—	—	—	5,981
TOTALS	$ 31,863	$ 24,335	$ 25,385	$ 87,564

SUMMARY OF PEP COSTS -- Fall, 1979

(Through December 15, 1979)

PEP I	$ 5,295
PEP II (M)	2,103
PEP II (B)	8,807
PEP III	1,478
Evaluation	3,611
HELP Center	371
Start-Up Costs	10,198
TOTAL	$ 31,863

PEP FUNDING -- Fall, 1979

PEP I (American Indian)

Course Number	Credits	Enrollment	Instructor(s)	Assistant(s)	Projected Costs	Actual Costs
1405-4	3	21	Woods			
1421-15	4	2	$1 330 (TA-I R)		$ 1,330	$ 1,330.00
				Raphael Szykowski (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	344.00
1708-1	2	25	Ledingham		-----	
			TwoBears		-----	
			Mackenzie		-----	
				Brooks Staples (UTA-WS) 20x10x$4=800	160	63.20
1831	4	37	Ledingham		3,186	3,186.00
				Donna Thompson (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	180.00
				Ramona Smith (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	192.00
				TOTAL	$ 5,876	$ 5,295.20

WS = Work Study

TA-I R = Reaching Associate I replacement

TA-II = Teaching Associate II

PEP FUNDING -- Fall, 1979

PEP II (Chicano Monolingual)

Course Number	Credits	Enrollment	Instructor(s)	Assistant(s)	Projected Costs	Actual Costs
1278	3	42*	Hinojosa-Smith		-----	
			Perez		-----	
			Cortez		-----	
1409	4	11	Lund-Chirinos			
			$1,330 (TA-I)		$ 1,330	
1429	3	11	Lund-Chirinos			$ 997.50
			$1,330 (TA-I)		1,330	
				Susan Johnson (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	240.00
1708-3	2	11	Perez		-----	
			Felland		-----	
				Skills Center	865	865.00
				TOTAL	$ 3,925	$ 2,102.50

*Bilingual and monolingual joint class

WS = Work Study

TA-I = Teaching Associate I

SKILLS CENTER BILINGUAL TUTORS

Assist in both Chicano programs	Ann Williams (UTA) 15x10x$4	$ 600
[1/3 charged to PEP II (M)]	Lynn Thompson (TA-I) 25%	998
[2/3 charged to PEP II (B)]	James Davies (TA-I) 25%	998
	TOTAL	$ 2,596 x 1/3 = $865 (M)
		2,596 x 2/3 = $1,731 (B)

PEP FUNDING -- Fall, 1979

PEP II (Chicano Bilingual)

Course Number	Credits	Enrollment	Instructor(s)	Assistant(s)	Projected Costs	Actual Costs
1278	3	42*	Hinojosa-Smith		-----	
			Perez		-----	
			Cortez		-----	
				Jerry Trujillo (UTA) 20x10x$4	$ 800	$ 520.00
				Roger Hernandez (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	376.00
1401-5	3	26	Gidmark $1,330 (TA-I R)		1,330	1,330.00
				Lisa Bowers-White (GTA) 8x5x$6.84	274	242.82
1402-5	3	12	Rosenberg			
1402-6	3	15	$2,660 (TA-I)		2,660	1,785.00
1403-3	1	25	Dylla			
1404-3	1	25	$1,330 (TA-I R)		1,330	1,330.00
1465-1	3	30	Hansen			
			$1,330 (TA-I R)		1,330	1,330.00
				Daniel Moore (UTA) 10x4x$4	160	88.00
1708-2	2	25	Perez		-----	
			Felland		-----	
			Cavillo		-----	
				Brook Haglund (UTA-WS) 20x10x$4=800	160	70.40
				Skills Center	1,731	1,731.00
				TOTAL	$ 10,175	$ 8,807.22

*Bilingual and monolingual joint class

WS = Work Study

TA-I = Teaching Associate I

TA-I R = Teaching Associate I replacement

PEP FUNDING -- Fall, 1979

PEP III (Black)

Course Number	Credits	Enroll-ment	Instructor(s)	Assistant(s)	Projected Costs	Actual Costs
1405-3	3	25	Knutson			
1421-8	4	10	$1,330 (TA-I R)		$ 1,330	$ 1,330.00
				Harold White (UTA-WS)		
				10x10x$4=400	80	86.80
1461-2	5	27	Bellamy		-----	
1708-4	2	35	White		-----	
			Cuz-n		-----	
			Smith		-----	
			Lang		-----	
				Melaku Endeshaw (UTA-WS)		
				20x10x$4=800	160	60.80
1815	5	33 PEP (49 total)	Smith		-----	
				TOTAL	$ 1,570	$ 1,477.60

WS = Work Study

TA-I R = Teaching Associate I replacement

PEP FUNDING -- Fall, 1979

		Projected Costs	Actual Costs
Evaluation			
Romano -- Assistants	Joan Garfield (TA-I) F--25% ($2,993÷3) (W--50%) (S--25%)	$ 998	$ 998.00
	Cora Hamzavia (URA) 2x10x$4		54.00
	Richard Bragg (URA) 20x11x$4 (replaced Hamzavia)	880	435.20
CSD (replacement)	Tom Carrillo 50% (TA-II R) $6,372÷3	2,124	2,124.00
	TOTAL	$ 4,002	$ 3,611.20
HELP Center:			
Peer Advisors	Tam Bui (UTA-WS) 20x10x$4=800	$ 160	$ 110.40
	Myrna Stedman (UTA-WS) 20x10x$4=800	160	150.40
	Rollin Smith (UTA) 20x10x$4=800	160	110.40
	TOTAL	$ 480	$ 371.00

TA-I = Teaching Associate I

URA = Undergraduate Research Associate

TA-II R = Teaching Associate II replacement

UTA = Undergraduate Teaching Assistant

WS = Work Study

PEP FUNDING -- Fall, 1979

Start-Up Expenses

ACP

Arrington	Sept. 1-15	$ 868.89	
Dylla	" "	833.34	
Gidmark	" "	788.89	
Hansen	" "	1,266.67	
Knutson	" "	332.50	
Lund-Chirinos	" "	665.00	
Woods	" "	665.00	
			$ 5,420.29

SBS

Killen	Aug. 15 - Sept. 15	$ 2,361.00	
D. Jones	" "	1,967.00	
			4,328.00

CSD

Romano	Sept. 1-15	$ 450.00	450.00
		TOTAL	$ 10,198.29

SUMMARY OF PEP COSTS -- Winter, 1980

(Through March 15, 1980)

PEP I	$ 5,542
PEP II (M)	2,820
PEP II (B)	7,862
PEP III	1,450
Evaluation	4,730
HELP Center	338
SBM (Math)	1,593
TOTAL	$ 24,335

PEP FUNDING -- Winter, 1980

PEP I (American Indian)

Course Number	Credits	Enrollment	Instructor(s)	Assistant(s)	Projected Costs	Actual Costs
1405-2	4	9	Woods		$ 1,330	$ 1,330.00
1421-9		13	$1,330 (TA-I R)			
1422-16		0		Raphael Szykowski (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	140.00
				Minnie Oakgrove (UTA) 10x10x$4		204.00
1708-1	2	20	Ledingham		----	
			TwoBears		----	
			Mackenzie		----	
				Roger Welch (UTA-WS) 20x10x$4=800	160	96.00
1832	4	26	Ledingham $3,186 (TA-II)		3,186	3,186.00
				Ramona Smith (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	120.00
				Donna Thompson (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	466.00
				TOTAL	$ 5,876	$ 5,542.00

WS = Work Study

TA-I R = Teaching Associate I replacement

TA-II = Teaching Associate II

PEP FUNDING -- Winter, 1980

PEP II (Chicano/Hispanic Monolingual)

Course Number	Credits	Enrollment	Instructor(s)	Assistant(s)	Projected Costs	Actual Costs
1278*	3	19*	Paul Carrizales (1/4 TA-II) $1,062 ÷ 2 = $531		$ 531	$ 531.00
1409	4	13	Lund-Chirinos $1,330 (TA-I)		1,330	997.50
1429	3	11	Lund-Chirinos $1,330 (TA-I)		1,330	
				Susan Johnson (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	436.00
1708-3	2	10	Perez et al.		----	
				Skills Center**	865	855.00
				TOTAL	$ 4,456	$ 2,819.50

**SKILLS CENTER BILINGUAL TUTORS

		Projected Costs	Actual Costs
Assist in both Chicano programs [1/3 charged to PEP II (M)] [2/3 charged to PEP II (B)]	Ann Williams (UTA) 15x10x$4	$ 600	$ 570.00
	Lynn Thompson (TA-I) 25%	998	998.00
	James Davies (TA-I) 25%	998	998.00
	TOTAL	$ 2,596	$ 2,566.00

$2,596 x 1/3 = $865 (M)

$2,596 x 2/3 = $1,731 (B)

*Bilingual and monolingual joint class (1/2 charged to each)

WS = Work Study

TA-I = Teaching Associate I

TA-II = Teaching Associate II

PEP FUNDING -- Winter, 1980

PEP II (Chicano/Hispanic Bilingual)

Course Number	Credits	Enrollment	Instructor(s)	Assistant(s)	Projected Costs	Actual Costs
1278*	3	19*	P. Carrizales (1/4 TA-II) $1,602 ÷ 2 = $531		$ 531	$ 531.00
				Jerry Trujillo (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	320.00
1405-4 } 1421-7 }	4	2 19	Gidmark $1,330 (TA-I R)		1,330	1,330.00
				Lisa Bowers-White (GTA) 17%	506	505.75
1406-3	2	12	Rosenberg (GTA-R) 50%		1,785	1,785.00
1464-1	4	21	E. Hansen $41,330 (TA-I R)		1,330	1,330.00
1708-2	2	11	Perez et al.		----	
				Daniel Moore (UTA) 10x15x$4	200	100.00
				Julia Haglund (UTA-WS) 20x10x$4=800	160	77.60
				Roger Hernandez (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	172.00
				Skills Center**	1,731	1,711.00
				TOTAL	$ 8,373	$ 7,862.35

*Bilingual and monolingual joint class (1/2 charged to each)

**See PEP II Monolingual

WS = Work Study

TA-I = Teaching Associate I

TA-I R = Teaching Associate I replacement

TA-II = Teaching Associate II

PEP FUNDING -- Winter, 1980

PEP III (Black)

Course Number	Credits	Enrollment	Instructor(s)	Assistant(s)	Projected Costs	Actual Costs
1212	5	54 (32 PEP)	N. Smith		$ ----	$ ----
1405-3 } 1421-8 } 1422-7	4	10 15 7	Knutson $1,330 (TA-I R)	Harold White (UTA-WS)	1,330	1,330.00
				20x10x$4=800	160	20.80
1708-4	2	28	B. Smith et al.		----	----
				Melaku Endeshaw (UTA-WS)		
				20x10x$4=800	160	99.20
				TOTAL	$ 1,650	$ 1,450.00

WS = Work Study

TA-I R Teaching Associate I replacement

PEP FUNDING -- Winter, 1980

			Projected Costs	Actual Costs
SBM				
Math Instructor	Course Number	Enrollment		
	1431-4 1432-4 (reg. offering)	21		
	1431-9 1432-9 (PEP sections)	16	Myriam Steinbeck 1/2x75%x$12,744	$ 1,593	$ 1,593.00
			TOTAL	$ 1,593	$ 1,593.00
HELP Center				
Peer Advisors			Tam Bui (UTA-WS) 10x10x$4=400	$ 160	$ 103.20
			Myrna Stedman (UTA-WS) 20x10x$4=800	160	100.80
			Rollin Smith (UTA-WS) 20x10x$4-800	160	134.00
			TOTAL	$ 480	$ 338.00
Evaluation				
Romano -- Assistants			Joan Garfield (TA-I) 50% = $1,996	$ 1,996	$ 1,996.00
			Richard Bragg (URA) 20x11x$4	880	610.00
CSD - Replacement			Tom Carrillo (TA-II R) 50%	2,124	2,124.00
			TOTAL	$ 5,000	$ 4,730.00

WS = Work Study

TA-I Teaching Associate I

URA = Undergraduate Research Associate

TA-II R = Teaching Associate II replacement

SUMMARY OF PEP COSTS -- Spring, 1980

(Through June 30, 1980)

PEP I	$ 5,320
PEP II (M)	8,205
PEP II (B)	5,712
PEP III	1,438
Evaluation	1,996
HELP Center	590
CSD	2,124
TOTAL	$ 25,385

PEP FUNDING -- Spring, 1980

PEP I (American Indian)

Course Number	Credits	Enroll-ment	Instructor(s)	Assistant(s)	Projected Costs	Actual Costs
1405-2		3	Shaw			
1421-9	4	8	$1,330 (TA-I R)		$ 1,330	$ 1,330.00
1422-6		12		Minnie Oakgrove (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	496.00
1708-1	2	16	Ledingham		----	
			Mackenzie		----	
			TwoBears		----	
				Donna Thompson (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	200.00
1833	4	20	Ledingham $3,186 (TA-II)		3,186	3,186.00
				Ramona Smith (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	108.00
				TOTAL	$ 5,716	$ 5,320

UTA = Undergraduate Teaching Assistant

TA-I R = Teaching Associate I replacement

TA-II = Teaching Associate II

PEP FUNDING -- Spring, 1980

PEP II (Chicano/Hispanic Monolingual)

Course Number	Credits	Enrollment	Instructor(s)	Assistant(s)	Projected Costs	Actual Costs
1401-4	3	19*	Gidmark $1,330 (TA-I R)		$ 1,330	$ 1,330.00
				Carol Singh (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	304.00
1402-2 and 1402-3	3 3	19*	Rosenberg (1/2 GTA)		1,785	1,785.00
				Susan Johnson (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	432.00
1403-2	2	19*	Lund-Chirinos (1/2 TA-I)		1,995	1,995.00
1404-2	2	19*				
1465-2	3	20*	Hansen (TA-I R)		1,330	1,330.00
				Daniel Moore (UTA) 10x10x$4	400	100.00
1708-4	2	20*	Felland et al.		----	
				Jerry Trujillo (UTA-WS) 10x10x$4	400	63.60
				Skills Center**	865	865.00
				TOTAL	$ 8,905	$ 8,204.60

*Includes 8 Asian/American students

**See Chicano/Hispanic Bilingual

TA-I R = Teaching Associate I replacement

WS = Work Study

PEP FUNDING -- Spring, 1980

PEP II (Chicano/Hispanic Bilingual)

Course Number	Credits	Enrollment	Instructor(s)	Assistant(s)	Projected Costs	Actual Costs
1278	4	17	Carrizales		$ 2,124	$ 2,124.00
				Jerry Trujillo (UTA-WS) 10x10x$4	400	63.60
1422-7	4	10	Gidmark (TA-I R)		1,330	1,330.00
				Lisa Bowers-White (GTA 17%)	506	362.52
1708-2	2	20	Perez et al.		----	
				Julia Haglund (UTA-WS) 10x10x$4	400	100.80
				Skills Center**	1,731	1,731.00
				TOTAL	$ 6,491	$ 5,711.92

**SKILLS CENTER BILINGUAL TUTORS

Assist in both Chicano programs

[1/3 charged to PEP II (M)]
[2/3 charged to PEP II (B)]

Ann Williams (UTA) 15x10x$4	$ 600	$ 570.00
Lynn Thompson (TA-I) 25%	998	998.00
James Davies (TA-I) 25%	998	998.00
TOTAL	$ 2,596	$ 2,566.00

$2,596 x 1/3 = $865 (M)

$2,596 x 2/3 = $1,731 (B)

WS = Work Study

TA-I R = Teaching Associate I replacement

PEP FUNDING -- Spring, 1980

PEP III (Black)

Course Number	Credits	Enrollment	Instructor(s)	Assistant(s)	Projected Costs	Actual Costs
1405-3 1421-10 1422-8	4	1 2 21	Knutson (TA-I R)		$ 1,330	$ 1,330.00
1708-3	2	20	C. White et al.		----	
				Melaku Endeshaw (UTA-WS) 10x10x$4	400	108.00
1816	4	15	Bellamy		----	
				TOTAL	$ 1,730	$ 1,438.00

WS = Work Study

TA-I R = Teaching Associate I replacement

PEP FUNDING -- Spring, 1980

		Projected Costs	Actual Costs
SBM			
Math Instructor		----	----
HELP Center			
Peer Advisors	Roger Welch (UTA-WS) 10x10x$4	$ 400	$ 148.80
	Myrna Stedman (UTA-WS) 10x10x$4	400	172.80
	Rollin Smith (UTA-WS) 10x10x$4	400	268.80
	TOTAL	$ 1,200	$ 580.80
Evaluation			
Romano -- Assistant	Joan Garfield (TA-I) 50% = 1,996	1,996	1,996.00
	TOTAL	$ 1,996	$ 1,996.00
CSD - Replacement	Tom Carrillo (TA-II) 50%	$ 2,124	$ 2,124.00
	TOTAL	$ 2,124	$ 2,124.00

UTA-WS = Undergraduate Teaching Assistant-Work Study

TA-I = Teaching Associate I

TA-II = Teaching Associate II